

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1-17 are pending, in which in which claims 1, 3, 5, 9-11, and 13-17 are currently amended, and no claims are canceled, withdrawn, or newly presented. Claims 3, 5, and 14 have been amended to resolve discovered informalities. No new matter is introduced.

The Office Action mailed August 27, 2004 rejected claims 1-17 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on *Ng et al.* (US 6,374,254) in view of *Glass* (US 6,321,261).

Claims 1, 3, 5, 9-11, 13, and 15-17 have been amended consistent with claim 14.

The rejection of claims 1-17 under *Ng et al.* in view of *Glass* is respectfully traversed because the references fail to suggest or disclose the features of the claims. For example, amended independent claim 1 recites a “method for persistently storing an object belonging to a class” and “instantiating a persistent agent based on a name identifying the class, said persistent agent providing an interface including a routine for persistently storing the object in a persistent object store.”

Ng et al. (per col. 1:58-60) is directed to an “apparatus and methods for creating indexes in a relational database corresponding to classes in an object-oriented application.” In particular, *Ng et al.* discloses the use of a GUI-style object-database mapping tool **508** whereby a user may select fields of a class and have corresponding indexes generated for the user-selected fields (col. 7:49-56; col. 8:3-7). *Ng et al.* further disclose a database connectivity DBC module **208** that provides an API for Java™ applications to make SQL calls to a database (col. 6:12-35). *Ng et al.* does not disclose, however, that any agent, much less a persistent agent, is instantiated based on a name identifying a class, as correctly acknowledged by the Office Action (p. 4, lines 2-3).

Glass too fails to teach this feature. In *Glass*, a method of constructing an object remotely across a computer network (per title) includes creating a local virtual Java™ object **100** from a virtual Java™ class in a first host address and port number **102**, and creating a remote Java™ object 104 from the virtual Java™ class by specifying the address of a second host address and port number 110 in which the created object is to reside (per Abstract). The Office Action, however, (p. 4, first and third paragraphs, emphasis added) states: “Glass provided more details on **naming conventions** used when constructing an object” and contends: “Therefore, it would have been obvious, to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified Ng’s invention, to include details regarding **the naming of created persistent agents**, because a program only requires a unique identification, a name is merely a mnemonic, useful to a programmer for easily identifying code segments. **Naming an agent (object) based on a name identifying a related class** is well known in the art.” However, claim 1, directed to a “method for persistently storing an object belonging to a class,” recites, “instantiating a persistent agent **based on a name identifying the class**” which specifies how the agent is instantiated, and not how the agent is named. If the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims *prima facie* obvious. *In re Ratti*, 270 F.2d 810, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959). MPEP § 2143.01 Thus, the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

For reasons similar to those discussed above regarding claim 1, the rejection of independent claims 11 and 13-17 should also be withdrawn.

The rejection of dependent claims 2-10 and 12, which depend from claims 1 and 11, respectively, should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons as those discussed above with

regard to their respective independent claims, and these claims are separately patentable on their own merits.

Therefore, the present application, as amended, overcomes the objections and rejections of record and is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration is respectfully requested. If any unresolved issues remain, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned attorney at 703-425-8516 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully Submitted,

DITTHAVONG & CARLSON, P.C.

November 29, 2004
Date

Margo Livesay
Margo Livesay, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 41,946

Stephen C. Carlson
Reg. No. 39,929

Attorneys for Applicant(s)

10507 Braddock Rd
Suite A
Fairfax, VA 22032
Tel. 703-425-8516
Fax. 703-425-8518